



**Northern Central City Corridor Study  
Community Reference Group  
Discussion Notes  
Meeting 3, 13 June 2001  
Richmond Town Hall**

<b>PRESENT:</b>		
<b>COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP MEMBERS</b>		
Rodger	Eade	Chair, Community Reference Group
Brian	Evans	Parkville Association
Paul	Jarman	Department of Infrastructure
Robert	Abboud	VicRoads
Peter	Mildenhall	Department of Education, Employment and Training
Ian	Bird	Carlton Residents Association
Fiona	De Preu	University of Melbourne
Ben	Smith	Environment Victoria
Vincent	Hartigan	National Bus Company
William	Taylor	Department of Infrastructure
Paul	Mees	Royal Park Protection Group Inc.
Robyn	Williams	Councillor, City of Yarra
Peter	Graf	City of Yarra
Christopher	Pound	East Clifton Hill Traffic Management
Richard	Smithers	Bicycle Victoria
Geoff	Barbour	Fitzroy Residents Association
Peter	Daly	RACV
Laurie	Cuttiford	RMIT
Peter	Mallet	North and West Melbourne Association
Anne	Lyon	Department of Human Services
<b>STUDY TEAM</b>		
Bob	Evans	Study Director
William	McDougall	Study Manager
Stephen	Smith	Strategic Planner, City of Melbourne
Bruce	Turner	Fulcrum International
Susan	Hopley	Department of Infrastructure (Public Affairs Section)
Representatives from specialist study teams		
<b>OBSERVING</b>		
Colin	Smith	Royal Park Protection Group
W	Bassett	Princes Park Protection Group
<b>APOLOGIES</b>		
Kevin	Chamberlin	Councillor, City of Melbourne
Warwick	Pattinson	City of Melbourne
Stephen	O'Callaghan	Bus Association Victoria
Steve	Watson	Councillor, City of Yarra
Peter	Navaretti	RMIT
Brian	Negus	VicRoads
Paul	Davies	Rathdowne Village Business Association
Chris	Goodman	3068 Group



**Northern Central City Corridor Study  
Community Reference Group  
Discussion Notes  
Meeting 3, 13 June 2001  
Richmond Town Hall**

No	Item	Discussion
1	<b>Welcome and Introduction</b>	The Chair of the Community Reference Group, Rodger Eade, welcomed CRG members, including new replacement members Peter Mildenhall (Dept. of Education, Employment and Training), Paul Mees (Royal Park Protection Group), Ian Bird (Carlton Residents Association), Anne Lyon (Department of Human Services), observers and study specialists.
2	<b>Previous meeting &amp; matters arising</b>	After reviewing the previous CRG meeting notes the CRG noted that its contents were an adequate representation of proceedings. No matters arising from the previous minutes were raised at this stage of the meeting.
3	<b>Progress to date</b>	<p><b>3.1 Community Consultation</b> Discussion notes from the Community Forum on 23 May were distributed. The notes include all comments made by the public at the forum, as well as additional comments placed on feedback sheets at the forum. The notes are available to the general public on the study website. Fiona de Preu noted that issues concerning bicycle travel featured heavily at the forum and hoped that cycling initiatives would feature strongly in the study.</p> <p><b>3.2 Community Update – Questionnaire</b> William McDougall tabled a graph describing some of the responses from the questionnaire contained in the first community update to all property owners and occupiers in the study area. Of the approximate 40,000 brochures mailed out, over 1,000 responses have been received so far, of which 70% are from members of the community within the study area. Cr Robyn Williams mentioned that as chair of the Inner Melbourne Community Road Safety Council, she was surprised to see more people were satisfied than dissatisfied with safety for pedestrians, bearing in mind the number of complaints and accidents in the study area. Paul Mees mentioned that this finding does not necessarily mean the facilities for pedestrians are good, but rather that people are likely to accept lower standard facilities because of the nature of the area. William McDougall mentioned that responses from people residing in the inner suburban areas, such as Collingwood and Abbotsford, showed a higher degree of dissatisfaction within the range of questions surrounding road congestion, traffic noise and traffic pollution than outer to middle suburban respondents.</p> <p><b>3.3 Specialists</b> Rodger Eade explained that one of the key issues in the selection process was the potential for a perceived conflict of interest due to the role of the Study Manager, William McDougall of Sinclair Knight Merz (SKM), and the potential selection of SKM to carry out one or more of the specialist studies. SKM were nominated/short-listed in four categories (Social, Environmental, Transport and Engineering). This was addressed by ensuring minimal involvement of William McDougall in the selection process for the four areas in which SKM were short-listed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• initial assessments were carried out by the Study Director, Bob Evans, in these areas;</li> <li>• an independent review of the submissions in each of the four areas was conducted by Department of Infrastructure officers not connected to the study;</li> </ul>



**Northern Central City Corridor Study  
Community Reference Group  
Discussion Notes  
Meeting 3, 13 June 2001  
Richmond Town Hall**

No	Item	Discussion
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the process was reviewed by the study's Technical Steering Committee and they recommended the appointment of the nominated specialists (on a motion put and seconded by the Council representatives); and</li> <li>• a review of the entire process by the Department of Infrastructure's Accredited Purchasing Unit.</li> </ul> <p>As a result, the recommendations have been accepted and the specialists appointed as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Sociology:</b> Sinclair Knight Merz, team leader Bridget Cramphorn</li> <li>2. <b>Environmental:</b> Maunsell McIntyre, team Leader Bronwyn Ridgway</li> <li>3. <b>Heritage:</b> Helen Lardner Conservation and Design, Helen Lardner.</li> <li>4. <b>Land Use:</b> Maunsell McIntyre, team leader Christine Barnes.</li> <li>5. <b>Transport:</b> Sinclair Knight Merz, team leader David Ashley.</li> <li>6. <b>Engineering Feasibility:</b> Sinclair Knight Merz, team leader Neil King.</li> </ol> <p>Rodger also informed the CRG that a concise version of the evaluation is available to the CRG, and that arrangements would be put in place to manage the ongoing performance of the specialists.</p> <p>Peter Daly commented that the selection process appeared robust and commended the study team for this approach.</p>
4	<b>Reports back from CRG members</b>	<p>Richard Smithers stated he was happy for his comments on bicycle issues to be made available to CRG members. William mentioned that unless members request that their comments be treated confidentially information will be available for perusal on the study website.</p> <p>Paul Mees asked if there was a process in place to work out what solutions are available to certain improvements being suggested, noting for example that the Eastern Freeway extension to Ringwood will worsen traffic problems in the study area. He commented that the study needs reliable data to assess origin and destination patterns for both people and goods within and through the study area. Rodger Eade commented that we needed to identify the problems before we identify solutions.</p>
5	<b>Specialists presentations</b>	<p><b>5.1 Presentations</b></p> <p>Rodger Eade invited the team leaders (names supplied in section 3.3) from the 6 study streams to give 5-minute presentations to the CRG. The presentations outlined the methodology and time line of each specialist component. In the absence of social stream team leader Bridget Cramphorn, Michael Read from Sinclair Knight Merz presented, whilst Christine Barnes from Maunsell McIntyre presented (in addition to the land use stream) on behalf of environment stream team leader Bronwyn Ridgway. Rodger mentioned that all key members of the specialists team attended an initial workshop and briefing session the day before to bring them up to speed on relevant issues and study progress to date.</p> <p><b>5.2 Question and Answer Time</b></p> <p>Brian Evans (Parkville Association) asked what data sources would be used for information on traffic movement patterns and reasons for travel, for both light and heavy vehicles. David Ashley (SKM –Transport) replied</p>



**Northern Central City Corridor Study  
Community Reference Group  
Discussion Notes  
Meeting 3, 13 June 2001  
Richmond Town Hall**



No	Item	Discussion
		<p>that VATS (Victorian Activity and Travel Survey) data would be used for person travel analysis. Malcolm Daff (SKM – Transport) added that, for trucks, all available spot data would be gathered, trends analysed and other information reviewed to understand the nature of truck movements and types of vehicles. Paul Mees (Royal Park Protection Group) commented that truck count data does not give origin and destination information and suggested that registration number surveys should be considered. Mark Knudsen (Veitch Lister – Transport) observed that registration number surveys, whilst valuable, do not give information about ultimate origins and destinations beyond the points of observation.</p> <p>Richard Smithers (Bicycle Victoria) asked about funding of bike networks – who will build the networks that the study might recommend? Robert Abboud (VicRoads) asked about funding in a more general sense – who will identify the different levels of responsibility for funding the strategy components? William McDougall replied that the study team would make recommendations on all funding implications as part of the final strategy.</p> <p>Fiona de Preu (Melbourne University) observed that deliveries within the area needed examination, citing an example of light van deliveries made all over the University campus when a centralised delivery with trolleys for the sub-locations would be more efficient</p> <p>Laurie Cuttiford (RMIT) asked to what extent the study will consider the other ends of trips entering and leaving the study area – what is happening at the demand end, and how can trip choices be influenced there? William replied that this is an important element to be studied, and VATS data would be examined for this. Also the model used for the study covers the entire metropolitan area. Graham Currie (Booz Allen – Transport) said that the travel information will be examined from a market perspective – identifying the different travel markets (to and from, within and through the area, for example), their volumes, mode shares and so on, to understand which movements will be impacted by the various options.</p> <p>Ben Smith (Environment Victoria) observed that the adequacy of traffic movement data and projections is vital for informed decision making and has been raised by a number of people in the meeting – Ben said it was important to record this in the minutes. He also commented that the specialists had said a lot about greenhouse issues; any strategy adopted <u>must</u> lead to a reduction in greenhouse gases rather than an increase or a neutral impact.</p> <p>Ian Bird (Carlton Association) stated his view that both SKM and Maunsell are long-term VicRoads consultants. He sought assurances that all issues raised would remain on the table and would not be influenced by this. Rodger Eade replied that it was also up to CRG members to ensure that the study's outcomes are appropriate for the area.</p> <p>Paul Mees (Royal Park Protection Group) called for an independent peer review of the processes, especially the modelling (citing differences between the Trips model and VATS data for the percentage of Eastern Freeway trips reaching the Tullamarine Freeway) and the costing of</p>



Northern Central City Corridor Study  
Community Reference Group  
Discussion Notes  
Meeting 3, 13 June 2001  
Richmond Town Hall



No	Item	Discussion
		<p>tunnelling, which may prove to be the most sensitive issues. Rodger Eade commented that if this were done, the reviewer(s) would have to be external to the team.</p> <p>Brian Evans (Parkville Association) commented that many people are sceptical of the results of modelling and traffic prediction (quoting examples of promises from Western Ring Road and City Link proponents of traffic changes that did not materialise). He suggested that real-time trials (such as road closures or temporary truck bans) should be considered as alternative means of testing the effects. When access to Macarthur Road was blocked recently due to tram track replacement in Royal Parade, the impact was not too severe.</p> <p>Richard Smithers (Bicycle Victoria) asked about economic analysis, the effectiveness of economic analysis procedures to effectively capture all the effects, and whether the analysis would be easy to understand. David Ashley (SKM – Transport) replied that economic analysis is only one part of the triple-bottom-line assessment procedure, and that it would be done to current reporting guidelines which amongst other things are designed to make it more comprehensible. Lara Poloni (Maunsell – Land Use) added that the business impacts analysis to be undertaken by Essential Economics would add to the transport economics. Mark Knudsen observed that the Scoresby EES process was a move away from traditional Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR)-type analysis to take into account other modes of transport and wider economic effects, which this study could build upon further. Bob Evans observed that this study is a good opportunity to present the Government with a triple bottom line approach that focuses on things other than the dollars.</p> <p>In response to comments made by Paul Mees (RPPG) about funds being spent on heritage possibly being diverted to more information on truck movements, Helen Lardner (heritage and urban design) commented that the task of the heritage specialists was partly to ensure that heritage did NOT become an issue in the study. Their role is to provide information and assessments of heritage and urban design issues to ensure that the ultimate strategy did not have a negative heritage impact, but identified positive benefits wherever possible.</p> <p>Paul Jarman (DOI/Heritage Victoria) agreed that heritage was important. He also asked about the overall management of the process, observing that the specialists would need to be working in a highly interactive environment to address all the issues effectively. William McDougall replied that the DOI core study team would undertake this coordination.</p> <p>Peter Malatt (North &amp; West Melbourne Assoc) asked if this study would only produce a range of performance indicators or funding scenarios and nothing more. Rodger Eade replied that the study would certainly do more than that, identifying a range of options from which a strategy will emerge. William McDougall added that it is a challenge for the study to come up with a workable, effective and viable strategy, complete with recommendations on its implementation, covering the steps to be taken following adoption of the study findings, through to full implementation.</p>



**Northern Central City Corridor Study  
Community Reference Group  
Discussion Notes  
Meeting 3, 13 June 2001  
Richmond Town Hall**

No	Item	Discussion
6	<b>Media related issues</b>	<p>Rodger Eade asked the CRG for comments on what they would like to see in a media release following the meeting. The following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reinforcement of the importance of public transport</li> <li>• Scepticism about transport modelling</li> <li>• The need for good origin-destination information on cars and trucks</li> <li>• The importance of the greenhouse gas issue which must underpin any outcomes</li> <li>• Recognition of the ongoing commitment and interest from Community Reference Group members</li> </ul> <p>Ben Smith (Environment Victoria) asked if a draft press release could be circulated before release. Rodger Eade replied that this would not be possible in the time available but agreed that a copy of the final release should be distributed to all members. William McDougall reminded the meeting that another, more direct form of communication was the Community Update; the next one would be prepared to herald the release of the "Existing Conditions" report.</p>
7	<b>Other business</b>	<p>Rodger mentioned that the study team had prepared Resource Kits for CRG members. The kits have been supplied so members can keep all meeting minutes and relevant study papers and contacts together. The kits are available on request.</p> <p>Ben Smith (Environment Victoria) said it was important for CRG members to have copies of papers for the meeting a few days prior, especially those that needed to circulate them for wider opinion. Rodger Eade replied that this would be ensured henceforth.</p> <p>Vincent Hartigan (Bus Association of Victoria) observed that reducing delays to buses once they leave the freeway/dedicated lane situation was vital to gaining patronage increases.</p> <p>William McDougall indicated that the next meeting (18 July) would discuss some preliminary findings on existing conditions, and would also address the assessment criteria further. The meeting after that (August) would present the draft findings on existing conditions, and would also examine the options as the study moves into the next phase at around this time.</p>
8	<b>Close</b>	<p>Rodger Eade thanked participants for attending the CRG meeting and closed the proceedings at approximately 8.30pm.</p>
9	<b>Next Meeting</b>	<p><b>18 July 2001</b>, 6pm light supper 6.30 start – 8.30pm University House, University of Melbourne. Please RSVP to Stephen Smith 9655 8770 or <a href="mailto:stephen.smith@doi.vic.gov.au">stephen.smith@doi.vic.gov.au</a> by 13 July 2001.</p>